Arrangements for answering Questions in the absence of Ministers concerned

Sri G. CHANDRAKANT.—On a point of order. As a matter of fact I had put the question which has been included in the list today. Unfortunately the Minister concerned has informed that he will not be here and it is held over.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He is going on a foreign tour and some other Minister will look after his department. It appears that the Chief Minister is making alternate arrangements for the reply and that is why I have held over the question.

ಶ್ರೀ ನದಾಫಿವಪ್ಪ ಪಾಟೀಲ್ (ದೇವದುರ್ಗ).—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್, ಸರ್. ಈಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿರಲಿ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ, ಅಥವಾ ಎರಡು ದಿವಸ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ವಾರದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಗೇ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಡಿಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಪವಿತ್ರನದಿವಸ ಶಂಕರರಾಯರು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರಾಗಿ ಡೆನ್ಮಾರ್ಕ್ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರು ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಚಾರ್ಜನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಅಥವಾ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ವಹಿಸಲಾರದೇ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ವಹಿಸಲಾರದೇ ಹೊಗಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಯಾರು ಹೊರುತ್ತಾರೆ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whether the Hon. Minister has handed over charge or not, is not a question that concerns the Chair or the House. It is the responsibility of the Chief Minister.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Rules 42 and 44, lay down how the question is to be put before the House and how the answer is to be given. Unfortunately, according to ruling of the Chair, since the Hon ble Minister for Veterinary Services, is going on tour, it is the responsibility of the Ministry to answer that question. As per rule, in the absence of the member concerned the question will lapse. What action can the Chair take under Rules 42, 43, 44 and 45 if the question lapses even after all the formalities are observed ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 42 does not apply to this particular case. Rule 42 (3) provides, if the member is absent, his absence will be construed to mean that he is not present. Sub-Rule (2) reads like this :

> " The member so called shall rise in his place and unless he states that it is not his intention to ask the question standing in his name, he shall ask the question by reference to its number on the list of questions."

Here the member has put his question and since the Minister in charge is absent, the question is held over. Of course the absence of the Minister is a breach of courtesy. It is the duty of the Government to answer questions. But in the present circumstance, the Government is not aware of the absence of the Minister. The Chief Minister has offered to answer the question. There is specific rule in this regard. Therefore it was withheld.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—There is nothing to be annoyed. I have myself offered to answer this question. That is why the question is held over. I will answer that question tomorrow. Hence I think, there is no need for any discussion on this matter.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—You were pleased to say that if the Minister or the Government did not answer the question, it amounts to breach of courtesy, but not breach of privilege. May I take up the ruling of the Chair as an observation because that would strengthen the hands of the Government hereafter and it may not answer some questions at all?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It may not be taken as a ruling. If a ruling is necessary, I reserve my ruling.

Question of Privileges against the Marshal for alleged discourtesy shown to Members

Sri AZEEZ SAIT (Narasimharaja).—On 21st of this month there was an uproar in this House and at that time, the Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs moved a privilege motion against Sri Gopala Gowda. At that time I got up to say something. At the same time Sri Nagappa and Sri Bangarappa also got up to say something. There was confusion. But the Chair without hearing us ordered us to withdraw from the House. As you know, we wanted to protest that it was not in order. You adjourned the House for 10 minutes and went away. After the adjournment, we also retired for a cup of Tea in the lobby. The House re-assembled after 90 minutes. At that time I was about to get into the Chambers. Your so called Marshal who was standing in the lobby physically obstructed me from entering the House and twisted my left hand. My question is, whether he had the orders of the Hon. Speaker to bodily prevent me from entering the House. He manhandled me and acted in discourteous manner. Therefore, I want to move a privilege motion against the Marshal for his discourtious behaviour towards an hon. Member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member has said two things. The first thing is whether the Marshal was under orders to carry out the decision taken here. Whenever a decision is taken here, it is the duty of the Marshal to carry out the decision not only of the Chair but also of the entire House. But the fact whether he has twisted the hand of the hon. Member or not; is to be investigated. On this account I admit the privilege motion under Rule 182 and I refer it to the Committee of Privileges.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—While thanking you for having admitted the motion and referred it to Privileges Committee, I would like to draw your kind attention to the fact that the Hon'ble members of the House have